DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 445 SO 024 720

AUTHOR Ewing, E. Thomas
TITLE Soviet Teachers and the Politics of Identity, 1931-1939.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 7, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Historiography; History Instruction; Modern History; *Non Western Civilization; *Politics of Education; *Social History; State Action; State Programs; States Powers; Statewide Planning; *World History
IDENTIFIERS Stalin (Joseph); *USSR

ABSTRACT

This historical review describes the expansion of elementary and secondary education in the Soviet Union during the decade of the 1930's under the Stalinist regime. This study explores how teachers participated in shaping the relationship between education and Stalinist political culture by examining how teachers made sense of their position in society and how this understanding shaped their actions and attitudes. By focusing on the identities of Soviet teachers, this study draws on important new approaches to the history of education and the study of Stalinism. To explore the relationship between the lives of teachers and the images constructed in public discourse, particular attention is devoted to Olga Fedorovna Leonova, a Moscow elementary teacher who was a delegate to the 8th All Union Congress of Soviets in 1936. Highlights of the life and career of this teacher and the interweaving of her life with the Stalinist tradition and expectations are described. The history of the decade is recalled with specific incidents from this woman's career, as well as the experiences of other teachers of this time. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 445

Soviet Teachers and the Politics of Identity, 1931-1939

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. THOMAS EWING

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

E. Thomas Ewing

Department of History

University of Michigan

1994 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

New Orleans

April 7, 1994

SO 024 720

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although the Russian Communist Party came into power in 1917 with a promise to carry out radical educational reform, a sustained effort to transform mass schooling did not begin until more than ten years after the revolution. In the late 1920s, the Soviet government began to devote considerable attention and resources to the spread of universal education, resulting in a vast expansion of schools and increased enrollment of twenty million students by the end of 1930s. In this same period, the number of elementary and secondary teachers more than tripled, increasing from 365,000 in 1928 to 1,117,000 in 1939. The expansion of the school system was accompanied by increasingly conservative educational reforms intended to realize political objectives of strengthening order, hierarchy, authority, and discipline in Soviet society. As part of this shift in educational policy and pedagogical theory, the government strengthened the role of the teacher as a way of cultivating acceptance of the existing distribution of power and authority in schools and in society. With this teacher-centered approach to education, the Stalinist government hoped to use schools to consolidate its control of society and prepare the population for further social and political development.[1]

In a context where educational reforms were determined primarily by political considerations, the Stalinist state was heavily involved in the definition of teachers' identities. As teachers engaged in the process of defining who they were, they had to contend with the state's definition of what teachers should be. In particular, teachers were presented with an idealized image of their profession, constructed in the public sphere monopolized by the state, that reproduced the values sanctioned by the government. While recognizing that official images significantly influenced the process of defining identities, it is also important to ask how identities were shaped by social and cultural factors independent of state aspirations and most importantly to ask about the ways that teachers participated in defining their own identities. By asking how teachers made sense of their position in society and how this understanding shaped their actions and attitudes, this paper explores the broader question of how teachers participated in shaping the relationship between education and Stalinist political culture.

By focusing on the identities of Soviet teachers, this study draws on important new approaches to the history of education and the study of Stalinism. In both fields, recent scholarship has moved beyond the study of institutions, ideologies, and leading personalities in order to focus on the attitudes, practices, and identities of actors. Historians in both fields also share an interest in understanding the relationship between stereotypes, images, and myths, on the one hand, and the actual experiences of actors, on the other. Among specialists in the study of education, increased research on the lives and work of teachers is part of a larger project of restoring subjectivity and "voice" to the actors at the center of educational processes.[2] Social historians of the Stalinist period have moved in a similar direction by asking about the ways that different social groups participated in shaping the social, political, and cultural relationships of the 1930s.[3]

In the Stalinist context, the government's emphasis on teacher-centered reform produced a great deal of information about the lives and work of individual teachers, including descriptions of instructional methods, personal backgrounds, and community activism. It would be a mistake, clearly, to accept these public statements as descriptions of the actual experiences of teachers, because of the regime's obvious political interest in presenting idealized accounts of teachers and their role in Soviet society. It would also be a mistake, however, to reject these images as "mere propaganda," because this would ignore the important influence that public images exerted on the perceptions and practices of teachers. Recognizing that public images were an important resource that teachers used to define their identities, this paper examines the complex and often ambiguous relationship between the lives of teachers and the images constructed in public discourse.

To explore this relationship, this paper devotes particular attention to a Moscow elementary teacher named Olga Fedorovna Leonova. In the fall of 1936, Leonova achieved sudden fame when she was appointed as a delegate to the VIII All Union Congress of Soviets. At the Congress, Leonova made a public promise that all of her pupils would finish the year by receiving only above

average grades. When a special commission tested her third grade students, they all received grades of "good" or "excellent" and the commission recognized that Leonova had fulfilled her promise. In October 1937, Leonova received further publicity when she was one of nineteen schoolteachers nominated as candidates in the uncontested elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

In the space of little over a year, Leonova was the subject of more than twenty newspaper and journal articles that described her personal biography, teaching experience, methods of instruction, and community activism. In these accounts, Leonova was described as one of the most advanced women of the Soviet Union, a leading figure on "the cultural front," a loyal fighter for the Leninist and Stalinist cause, and a dedicated political activist; she was also praised for teaching methods that made lessons lively and interesting for students, her careful attention to individual students and particularly those lagging behind the class, her attention to the appearance and conduct of her pupils, and her advice to parents on how to raise their children; finally, Leonova was celebrated for her kindness, generosity, enthusiasm, and "her big heart and exceptionally sensitive soul."[4]

These idealized accounts illustrated the important role assigned to teachers in government strategies directed at mobilizing the public, including teachers themselves, to accept certain officially sanctioned values. Leonova's promise to raise the academic performance of her pupils, like the pledges by Stakhanovite workers to set new production records, reaffirmed the offical claim that exertions of will and energy, with proper political guidance, could overcome any "objective" or "structural" obstacles. Leonova's emphasis on cultivating neatness, diligence, discipline, and respect for authority were related to government efforts to transform a predominantly peasant population to fit the needs of an urbanizing and industrializing society. In her willingness to instruct parents how to raise their children, Leonova acted out the state's assertion of its right to intervene into family and personal spheres in pursuit of political objectives. Finally, the presentation of Leonova as a model for children, parents, and society to admire and to emulate symbolically represented the hierarchical

relationship between the state, the Communist Party, and Stalin, on the one hand, and the Soviet people, on the other. The public construction of Leonova's identity--and by extension the definition of a public identity for all Soviet teachers--was thus a government strategy intended to promote acceptance of certain kinds of political relationships and social values.

In looking at these descriptions, however, it is important to remember that a real teacher stood behind these idealized images. Olga Leonova was born into a working class family in Moscow in 1895, the eldest of six children. When she finished the fourth grade, her father wanted her to become a seamstress, but her mother persuaded her husband to allow Leonova to continue her schooling. At age fourteen, Leonova began giving private lessons to earn money to pay for books. After finishing grammar school, Leonova worked part-time while studying for the teachers' exam, and at age seventeen she began teaching in a rural school. Leonova worked in this school for three years, but then returned to Moscow to care for her younger brothers and sisters when her mother died in 1916. After the Bolshevik revolution, Leonova taught in a Soviet school in Moscow, in Red Army literacy schools, and then for several years in programs for orphaned and homeless children *(besprizorniki)*. In 1930, Leonova began teaching in Model School No. 25, one of the best schools in Moscow, where she made her reputation as one of the most effective teachers in the city.[5]

As a female, non-Party teacher with more than a decade of teaching experience and only a secondary education, Leonova was highly representative of Soviet elementary teachers in the 1930s.[6] In addition, many features of her biography, including background in the "respectable" working class, the family's dilemma of choosing between further education or wage employment, the interruption of career in order to take care of family members, and the movement between different institutions within the broader educational and child-care occupational sphere, were representative of the experiences of women teachers in many societies in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[7] As a ceremonial political figure and an advocate of regime causes, Leonova was one of the few teachers

allowed to have a public voice in the Stalinist context. In this respect, the life and work of Leonova provide excellent material for a discussion of teachers' identities. While rejecting the regime's claim that Leonova spoke for all Soviet teachers, this paper suggests that the values, relationships, and aspirations revealed--sometimes indirectly--in her statements and practices provide important insights into the ways that Soviet teachers made sense of and acted out their roles in the Stalinist context.

A central element in public descriptions was the assertion that teachers occupied an important position in the Stalinist system. In 1937, an article published in the newspaper Izvestiia described Leonova's reaction to attending the 1936 Congress of Soviets, called to ratify the so-called Stalin Constitution:

> Sitting in the Kremlin Palace, in the midst of delegates representing the nation, Leonova thought of the words of Lenin: "Our schoolteacher should be raised to a standard he has never achieved, and cannot achieve, in bourgeois society." And now this promise of the great genius of humanity had been realized. Where, when, in what other country could a teacher, having the least rights of all those without any rights, receive such honor by participating along with government officials in shaping the basic laws of the country. She realized that she had done very little to fulfill the great trust that had been bestowed upon her.[8]

This description of Leonova was part of a larger effort to define teachers in terms of the achievements, aspirations, and values claimed by the Soviet state. An important component of this strategy was the declaration that Lenin's promise had been realized under the leadership of Stalin, because this claim affirmed both the cultural development of the Soviet Union in the Stalinist period and the superiority of the socialist system over the Russian past and contemporary "bourgeois" societies.

The definition of a reciprocal relationship between teachers and the state was also an important element in these representations. In the relationship constructed by the state, the authority and responsibility offered to teachers were expected to result in fulfillment of certain political obligations. The emphasis on authority, trust, and responsibility in public descriptions accompanied and contributed to the broader shift in Stalinist political culture in the direction of making individuals more accountable for carrying out the tasks defined by the government. The slogan "the teacher

decides everything" *(vse delo reshaet uchitel')* echoed the phrase used by Stalin, "cadres decide everything," to symbolize the government's shift in emphasis from economic expansion, as had been the focus from 1928 to 1931, to improvements in training and management techniques and an increased sense of individual responsibility deemed necessary to consolidate the achievements of the first stages of industrial expansion.[9]

In a series of administrative and pedagogical reforms issued after 1931, the Soviet government increased the responsibilities of individual teachers for instruction and socialization. The strategy of reinforcing "the leading role" of teachers was a deliberate break from the theories of collective instruction, unstructured learning environments, and experimental teaching methods discussed in the first decade of the Soviet state. Summing up the new direction of Soviet pedagogy, a teacher training textbook declared: *"Without the teacher and the teacher's leadership there is no process of education.* Soviet pedagogy proceeds from a recognition of the leading and chief role of the teacher in the process of education . . ." By defining the teacher as "the central figure" in education, Stalinist pedagogy created an image and an expectation of teachers as skilled masters and authoritative experts, the sole determinant of the success or failure of pupils, and the figure most responsible for providing pupils with proper communist values.[10]

To carry out the more responsible and authoritative roles defined for teachers, an idealized image was constructed in public discourse that synthesized the desired combination of personal, professional, and political qualities. A representative example of this ideal image was set out in a training program for secondary teachers:

> The qualities of the Soviet teacher include systematic mastery of Bolshevism, thorough knowledge of one's subject and well-grounded familiarity with related disciplines, knowledge of pedagogical science, a fair and loving relationship with children, comprehension of and a skilled approach to the unique psychology of each pupil ("pedagogical tact"), the ability to apply and improve on various instructional methods, the ability to maximize use of the internal resources and the surrounding environment of the school for instructional purposes, the obligation to be an example for pupils in everything, and close connections with parents.[11]

To encourage and reward teachers for demonstrating the qualities demanded by the regime, pedagogical journals published biographical accounts of individual teachers, lesson plans and teaching methods used by "the best teachers" received widespread publicity, and individual teachers were awarded prizes, pay bonuses, and ceremonial positions.

The treatment of Olga Leonova provides an excellent example of how this image was constructed around a single teacher. In addition to detailed biographical accounts that described her as "the best teacher" in her school and one of the best in Moscow, pedagogical journals published descriptions of the methods of instruction and discipline that Leonova used in her classroom. In all of these accounts, Leonova was presented as a model for pupils, parents, other teachers, and society more generally to respect and seek to emulate. Describing her reactions to being selected to attend the Congress of Soviets in 1936, Leonova declared:

> I always loved my work, but now I have such a desire to work that I simply do not want to leave the school. . . We Soviet teachers are a fortunate people. We have been entrusted with the upbringing *(vospitanie)* of our remarkable Soviet children. We will all work to raise our school and make it the best in the world. . . There is no task more honorable than cultivating children's love for the homeland and preparing them for their fortunate and happy life.[12]

Leonova thus demonstrated how the honor and respect offered to teachers were to be reciprocated by promises of professional commitment and political subordination.

The description of teachers in ways that embodied and expressed these idealized images was a political strategy and a manifestation of state power. Through its control of public discourse, the state sought to identify teachers with the achievements and objectives of the state and in this way to cultivate loyalty and obedience on the part of teachers. By strengthening the role of teachers, political officials hoped to include teachers as active supporters of the effort to reinforce social hierarchies in the interests of a stronger and more stable social order. As a political strategy, the creation of an idealized image was also an attempt to marginalize and repress alternative identities that might challenge or subvert the objectives of the state. As long as public discourse was filled with idealized

images defined by the state, there was little space left for teachers to articulate alternative identities and pursue competing interests.

In order to construct public images of the teaching profession, the state used individual teachers as models around whom the idealized public identity was constructed. Despite concerted efforts to present a consistently idealized image, however, tensions clearly existed between the actual identities of teachers and the aspirations of the regime. In these points of tension, it is possible to examine how factors other than government aspirations shaped public descriptions of teachers. As the work of historian Joan Scott has shown, definitions of gender differences often produce disruptions, contradictions, and notable silences in discourses. With this theoretical insight, we can ask how Stalinist discourse represented gender as an aspect of teachers' identities.[13]

Throughout the 1930s, there was virtually no public discussion of differences between male and female teachers.[14] In contrast to public discourse in many other societies, there was no discussion of the relative advantages of male or female teachers at different levels of the school system, women were promised equal pay and opportunities for promotion, and women teachers were permitted and even expected to continue teaching after they were married.[15] An even more striking silence was the almost complete absence of public references to the family status or obligations of teachers. In all of the articles that discuss Leonova as a model teacher, public activist, and Supreme Soviet candidate, there was only one mention of any kind about her family--a picture of Leonova and her daughter, Nina, that appeared in Izvestiia. There was no indication in any of the articles whether Leonova was ever married. In a 1938 article entitled "Thoughts of a Mother-Teacher on Character Education," Olga Leonova wrote "as a mother and as a teacher" about the proper way to bring up children, yet she made no references to her own child or to her experiences as a mother.[16]

In the few occasions when there was discussion of family responsibilities, the experiences of female teachers reveal an expectation that occupational identities should take priority over domestic

obligations. In 1933, a social studies teacher and Communist Party member, Babina, complained that the burdens of taking care of her two young children, her lack of a housekeeper, and repeated illness prevented her from dedicating all of her time to teaching and community activism. Rejecting these excuses on the grounds that both children were old enough to be in nursery school, the local Party organization accused Babina of showing a lack of commitment to teaching and setting a poor example for other non-Party teachers by her habit of arriving at the school just as the bell rang and leaving as soon as classes were finished.[17]

Similar assumptions about the balance between professional and family responsibilities apparently shaped the perceptions of school inspectors. In one report, a female teacher, T. A. Il'inskaia, was praised for her teaching methods and the excellent discipline in her class, but then the inspector offered a more guarded overall evaluation: "She is interested in her work and approaches it conscientiously, but having a nursing infant means that she cannot dedicate as much time to her work as do her fellow teachers." Another school instructor, reporting on final examinations, described how she found a female teacher, Shcherbakova, greatly agitated during an inspection because she had left her sick child at home alone in order to come the school. The inspector reported: "We sent a cleaning woman to the child, the teacher calmed down, and all went well. This fact demonstrated how seriously teachers approached these examinations. The teacher left a sick infant at home and nevertheless came to the examination." In each of these examples, a female teacher's commitment to family was depicted as potentially threatening to the more important professional obligations of the teacher in the school.[18] These examples reveal expectations of Soviet teachers that differed markedly from the situation in other industrialized states where female teachers were expected to give priority to family and domestic obligations, in many cases at the expense of their professional aspirations and achievements.[19]

While Stalinist discourse did not include any explicit discussion of gender differences, a

careful reading of public descriptions reveals the influence of more subtle assumptions about different identities of male and female teachers. In their published statements, both male and female teachers revealed an abstract yet pervasive expectation that female teachers were naturally more suited to work with children and were more oriented to the nurturing, personal, and emotional aspects of teaching. Responding to a survey, one young female teacher described with obvious delight how she was called "mama" by her pupils, but a male colleague, clearly not showing the same enthusiasm, declared: "In spite of my lack of desire to work as a teacher, I had a good relationship with students." These statements defined the teacher-pupil relationship as a natural affinity of the female teacher and more of a learned response and almost a reluctant confession from a male colleague.[20]

At a 1937 conference, a male teacher, Nikolai Mikhailovich Golovin, presented a vivid description of the official identity of the Soviet teacher:

> We have been entrusted by the Party and government with the most valuable material that our country has--our Soviet children. Many specialists work with lifeless materials, like metals, wood, and so on, but our materials are more valuable. . . A good teacher needs more than anything to possess love for children and love for teaching. The child immediately feels the relationship with the teacher. If the teacher is strict, but fair and attentive to the pupil, then the pupil will recognize this. If the teacher neglects the pupil and does not notice any kind of forward progress, this will have a chilling effect and will push the pupil among the laggards.

Discussing this same topic, a female teacher, V. V. Lupandina, used more intimate language to describe her experiences: "I love children and understand how the communist upbringing of children contributes to the building of socialism. This is the main thing and the rest is derivative." Although both teachers defined love for children as an essential characteristic of teachers, Golovin's language of resources, techniques, and outputs shifted the teacher-pupil relationship into the public and therefore male sphere, while Lupandina's emphasis was more clearly placed on the personal relationship between teacher and pupil.[21]

Profiles of prominent teachers also reinforced the association of female teachers with an abstracted sense of family and nurturing responsibility. While biographies of both male and female

teachers included similar references to excellent teaching, public service, and political activism, these accounts also tended to describe a more active and public role for male teachers that often included an assertion of authority outside the school, and a more limited and nurturing role for female teachers that emphasized classroom practices and personal relations with pupils. A comparison of descriptions of two teachers nominated to the Supreme Soviet, Olga Leonova and Georgii Ivanovich Spirkov, a male elementary teacher from a rural school near Leningrad, illustrates how these differences were constructed. Descriptions of Leonova tended to focus on her activities in the classroom, the personal relationship she established with pupils, and the advice and assistance that she provided to parents. Although there were general references to her public work, no details were given except in connection with her nomination as a Soviet delegate. In descriptions of the male teacher Spirkov, by contrast, the emphasis was on his leading role in collectivization and dekulakization, his service in the village council and regional administration, and his support for students who wanted to continue their education. Whereas Leonova was respected by parents and especially mothers for her kind and affectionate approach to children, Spirkov was praised for having the respect of the collective farmers and especially the older peasants for his long service to the community.

These two teachers also presented different versions of the difficulties of the Tsarist period and the rewards of teaching in Soviet schools. While Leonova drew attention to her family's poverty and the need to discontinue teaching to take care of her family, Spirkov attributed his difficulties to external factors: "the poverty of the teacher's life, the lack of rights, and the arbitrary power of tsarist bureaucrats. . . Working under autocratic conditions was difficult and burdensome for the teacher." Whereas the reward for Leonova's perservence in overcoming the obstacles of a poor family was the opportunity to create rewarding personal relationships with pupils and their parents, the validation for Spirkov's determination to continue teaching despite the conditions of autocracy was the opportunity to have important government leaders, including A. A. Zhdanov, the secretary of the

Central Committee, consult with him about the work of the teacher and possible reforms of the schools.[22] Although these descriptions make no explicit reference to gender differences, they clearly present contrasting images of the experiences and aspirations of male and female teachers.

The presence of gendered images in ways that were not acknowledged in official discourse suggests the influence of factors other than government intentions in shaping the public identities of teachers. A central objective in many recent studies has been to challenge traditional stereotypes of female teachers and to reveal experiences concealed or distorted by these stereotypes.[23] While sharing the same objectives of restoring subjectivity and voice to female actors, other studies have suggested that many female teachers accepted and perpetuated an ideology of domesticity and gender separateness, even when their own occupational status in the public sphere and their professional aspirations appeared to contradict the premises of this ideology.[24] In the Stalinist case, the affirmation of gender differences was not an explicit strategy of the state, given its repeated proclamations of the equality of men and women in Soviet society.[25] The persistence of these differential images, in contradiction to other aspects of government propaganda, suggests that official identities were also influenced by traditional social and cultural assumptions about the different roles of men and women. In addition, the presence of these images in statements made by individual teachers suggests that these assumptions were part of the identities that teachers defined for themselves. These patterns indicate that official ideologies were not simply invented by the Stalinist state, but in fact reflected certain aspects of teachers' own definitions of their own interests and aspirations.

The one aspect of official identities most firmly embraced by individual teachers was the assertion of the authority of the teacher. According to Stalinist pedagogy, the teacher's authority should extend to all aspects of the relationship with pupils and should be directed toward cultivating acceptance of hierarchical relations of discipline and order. The importance that Olga Leonova attached to authority was clearly illustrated in her explanation of the proper way to bring up children:

"In my work, I always make real efforts to strengthen conscious discipline, trying to make children understand that unless there is excellent discipline, neither studies nor work can be of high quality." Leonova called on parents and teachers "to form a closely-connected, united, and cooperative front" that would help children recognize that "our word is law" concerning issues of behavior and beliefs. The effectiveness of Leonova's methods of maintaining discipline were illustrated in an account by Tania Rubashkina, a former student: "Olga Fedorovna [Leonova] did not yell at us once during the entire year. If we began to make noise, she would remain silent, but she would give us such a look that we would immediately feel ashamed."[26] The case of Leonova clearly demonstrates how a teacher embraced the government's call to act as an authority in ways that could cultivate an internalized sense of order, discipline, and obedience in children.

This emphasis on authority was accompanied by efforts to encourage teachers to think of themselves as standing on a higher level than the society in which they lived and worked. The attention to cultural differences was particularly strong concerning rural teachers, who were instructed to present models of more disciplined, cultured, and "advanced" behavior to the peasantry. In 1934, young rural teachers in Siberia were criticized for succumbing to the influence of peasant culture:

> A large proportion of young rural teachers, as shown by their level of their development and prevailing interests, clearly do not differ significantly from rural youth . . . Teachers live the same life as these young people and bring into the school the worst features of the youth lifestyle. Raising young teachers above their surrounding rural environment . . . is the most rewarding task of Party organizations, education departments, and the educational union.

In particular, these teachers were accused of "lagging behind the worst elements in the village" by participating in drinking parties and, in the case of one female teacher, dating men from the village.[27]

Many teachers accepted this call to stand above the community and behave in more cultured and "advanced" ways, as revealed in this account by a former teacher:

> . . . some of the students are real hooligans. They are degenerate. Much of how good he (sic) is depends on his home. You go home and see how he lives. We did that as teachers. Good Lord, no wonder he is a hooligan. Complete poverty, absolutely no cultural conditions in the home, complete depravity. The mother is a prostitute or works all day and can never

> be with the children. The parents come home and they swear in front of the child using foul language, and of course such a child cannot come to school and suddenly be an angel.[28]

By defining himself as a model for students--and for their parents--to look up to and emulate, this teacher transformed an aspect of official images into an important element of his own identity.

Seeking to reinforce their sense of cultural superiority, teachers struggled to increase society's appreciation of their professional role. In the countryside, teachers fought constant battles against village councils, collective farms, and Party committees that wanted to assign them to work as bookkeepers, administrators, or simple field hands. As teachers realized, these efforts to control their labor were also a sign of a more persistent devaluing of their professional identity. Teachers criticized both peasants and local officials for spreading views of the teacher as "some kind of parasite who is not useful to anyone," or describing teachers as "aliens" *(chuzhdye liudi)*, "gluttons," and "self-seekers, scoundrels, and parasites." In Western Siberia, teachers who complained about food shortages were told: "We do not support loafers and we will not give you food and supplies unless you go hand in hand with us (to work in the kolkhoz). What good are you if all you do is teach pupils their A's and B's." Another official told teachers: "When all of the collective farmers have been supplied, then we can give you what remains, but I am afraid that there will be nothing left."[29]

Faced with this disparaging view of their profession, teachers used aspects of their official identity to strengthen their position in relation to the community and local officials. In a number of cases, teachers responded to perceived insults, abuse, and neglect by accusing local officials of violating Central Committee instructions, "failing to understand that the teacher is the central figure in cultural development in the village," and neglecting to treat teachers in a "Leninist" fashion. In 1932, a teacher named D. Kylasov in Cheliabinsk oblast criticized local school administrators for their failure "to implement the decrees of the Central Committee of the Party concerning the schools." Following publication of these criticisms in the educational union newspaper and public discussion at a regional teachers' conference, Kylasov was dismissed from teaching, accused of encouraging unrest

among his colleagues, and put on trial for disobeying and slandering local officials. In spite of this intimidation, Kylasov continued writing letters to the press and to higher level offices complaining about the way he had been treated. Following an investigation by the state prosecutor, Kylasov was cleared of charges and his tormentors were put on trial. Description of these experiences in the educational union newspaper under the heading, "Just retribution for the persecution *(travlia)* of a teacher," demonstrated that teachers had access to certain kinds of power as long as they expressed themselves in terms of the failure of local officials to implement Central Committee instructions.[30] In a poorly organized but highly bureaucratized society with chronic shortages of labor and material resources of all kinds, teachers clearly recognized the advantages of aligning themselves with central authorities by assuming aspects of the official identity constructed in public discourse.

On a more fundamental level, many teachers explained their experiences in the 1930s primarily in terms of the increased assertion of professional authority that resulted from Stalinist educational reforms. According to Semen Efimovich Khoze, whose teaching career of more than fifty years began in the early 1930s, increased authority involved both official images and relationships developed by teachers:

> In the 1930s the well known slogan of Lenin--the teacher should be raised to a position higher than any previous position--was far from realized. Unfortunately, the Leninist proclamation was received in many areas of the country as a declaration, as a slogan, but was not put into effect. Nevertheless, the teacher enjoyed recognition and authority among various strata and different social groups and the attitude of society was passed on to pupils. I have in mind respect, attention, and, if you like, obedience to the teacher.[31]

For Vladimir Samarin, a former teacher who emigrated from the Soviet Union during the war, Stalinist school reforms significantly improved the teacher's position:

> The teacher came to enjoy the great esteem and affection of his students. . . teachers as such unquestionably began to command greater respect. . . The teacher rose in the students' eyes both as an intellectual authority, a source of knowledge, and as a mentor, an elder comrade, a moral authority.[32]

These comments suggest that at least some teachers had "taken on" official identities and used them to

make sense of their professional roles.

The emphasis on authority in the identity of teachers reflected a combination of official definitions, which sought to recreate the hierarchical relations of the political culture within the classroom, and teachers' own experiences and aspirations, including the fear of being devalued by society, the desire to establish certain claims to expertise, and the attempt to establish relationships with students and parents that expressed and confirmed this view of themselves. Although teachers believed that authority was essential to their professional identity, their decision to take on and use this official identity should also be seen as a sign of acceptance of and conformity to certain regime values. By making authority into an important aspect of their identity, these teachers expressed their agreement with the shift toward a more disciplined, ordered, and hierarchical political culture.

In discussing the importance attached to authority in both educational discourse and the identities defined by teachers, it is important to recognize a distinction between authority and power.[33] Authority refers to the existence of shared legitimizing values that exist between actors or between actors and institutions, in which the enactment of different roles reflects some acceptance of the validity and necessity of unequal status. When educational reformers and teachers discussed authority, therefore, they usually referred to a mutual relationship between pupils and teacher that also included elements of respect, affection, compassion, or protection. By contrast, power refers to coercive actions that do not rely upon any shared sense of legitimacy between actors or acceptance of unequal relations on the part of subordinate groups. In both theory and practice, most teachers seemed to reject the use of coercion or violence in the classroom and accepted official prohibitions on the use of corporal punishment as a form of discipline.[34]

In the broader context of the 1930s, however, violence and coercion were essential elements of Stalinist political culture. The system of state terror included widespread use of surveillance, denunciations, interrogations, dismissals, arrests, show trials, exiles, and executions. Teachers were

constantly ordered to be vigilant and denounce manifestations of so-called anti-Party, anti-proletarian, or anti-Soviet ideologies that might be used by "class aliens" or "enemies of the people" to "penetrate" the schools and influence children. Educational journals and newspapers published articles with headlines such as "The class enemy behind the mask of the teacher," "Decisively expel the class enemy from among the ranks of Soviet teachers," "Cleanse the pedagogical front of the remnants of wrecking activity," or simply "Destroy the enemies of the people" and "More vigilance!"[35] Thousands of teachers were dismissed for "political" reasons, including their "unacceptable" social origins (coming from families of priests, nobility, kulaks, or wealthy traders), their connections to other people who were dismissed, expelled from the Party, or arrested for political reasons (most frequently, these cases involved female teachers married to Party or government officials), or actions or statements that revealed intentions judged to be suspect, mistaken, or outright hostile. Archival sources include cases of teachers dismissed because of math problems that understated the productivity of collective farms or dictation exercises that made favorable references to the Tsarist past, or because they showed sympathy for social groups or individuals repressed by the Stalinist government.[36]

The impact of the terror contradicted and undermined government efforts to increase the authority of teachers. Instead of becoming more visible and assuming greater authority, many teachers responded to the terror by withdrawing as much as possible from the public sphere. This pattern was noticed by Olga Leonova, who complained about the reticence of her fellow teachers:

> With respect to questions of production, we have made some progress and the teacher's voice is heard at conferences on methods. But where do you hear the teacher's voice speaking bravely and freely on political questions? When a political meeting is called to discuss some kind of campaign, what happens? We need to recognize that often what happens is an awful scene, with a lifeless, deadly silence. And what does the teacher feel during this time? Surely this does not mean that the interests of the country are not important to us? At this moment the teacher undergoes an internal struggle, becomes ashamed, silent, cannot find the words that would make it possible to speak freely, like necessary, like workers at a production meeting. And it is precisely in this situation that we teachers, and especially we elementary teachers, feel a great problem. In this, of course, we are guilty, but our

> leadership is also guilty, because they should be drawing closer to us and helping us overcome the problem of our political literacy.[37]

One former teacher described the Stalinist period in these terms: "Everyone tried to be in the shadows. Everyone fears responsibility, because responsibility means that you can be arrested. . . I had a responsible job as well as a dangerous job." This teacher compared the work of engineers or workers, who could just do their jobs and keep quiet, with his own position: "I . . . could not keep quiet, it was my duty to talk, and also I had to say the right thing."[38]

Teachers pursued a variety of strategies meant to distance themselves from any kind of political participation. According to accusations made by educational administrators and Party officials, many teachers were refusing to answer pupils' questions about political topics or they deferred all political questions to teachers who were Communist Party or Komsomol members.[39] Teachers refused to participate in political study groups or keep up with current Party policy statements, prompting officals to complain about the "apolitical" attitudes of the profession. One teacher, Arsenii Chernyshev, actually drew attention to his lack of interest in politics by announcing that he did not read any newspapers or political literature because they were unnecessary for his work as a teacher. Summoned to meet with the head of the local educational department, Chernyshev declared that since he was not a member of the Communist Party, he had no interest in its resolutions.[40]

The withdrawal of teachers from politics challenged the synthetic identity constructed in offical discourse which made professional authority inseparable from political loyalty and conformity. At a meeting of teachers in June 1937, a pedagogical official complained that too many teachers saw the school as a kind of oasis that could be isolated from current political conflicts. Describing children as prime targets of class enemies, the speaker declared that teachers who tried to remain neutral revealed a basic misconception about their role:

> They think that if they have an excellent knowledge of methods of elementary school

> instruction, then they can fulfill the functions of the teacher--but they cannot. . . For us, there cannot be any technical questions when it comes to the upbringing of children. For us, everything is political.

Warning that teaching meant more than knowing multiplication tables or spelling rules, the speaker declared that teachers must use every moment of their lessons for the political education of children.[41]

The tension between political and professional identities was revealed most explicitly in the experiences of A. V. Kliukina, a chemistry teacher in Western Siberia. Following her meeting with a certification commission, a local newspaper criticized Kliukina as politically uninformed and lacking knowledge of chemistry. In an appeal submitted to the local educational department, Kliukina conceded that her political literacy was weak, but she defended her knowledge of chemistry, her teaching ability, and the achievements of her students. Kliukina was primarily concerned, however, with the impact of public criticism on her classroom authority: "Following remarks that undermine the authority of the teacher in front of pupils, I cannot work in the school. If I ever do not know my subject, this means that there is nothing keeping me in the school." Within a few months, educational officials upheld Kliukina's appeal and instructed the newspaper to retract its allegations.[42] While accepting the state's demand for teachers to show some level of political involvement, Kliukina clearly saw knowledge of her subject, teaching ability, and professional authority in the eyes of students as the more important aspects of her identity as a teacher.

In a political culture that denied the legitimacy of critical voices and used state terror to silence dissent, teachers' efforts to establish boundaries between political and professional spheres should be seen as acts of resistance against the totalizing aspirations of the Stalinist state.[43] The political identities of Stalinist teachers thus included the tension between the assertion of a more authoritative role, which implied some acceptance of regime values, and the effort to separate professional and political identities, thus challenging government claims that only politically active and completely loyal teachers could be effective in the classroom.

The experiences and perceptions of Olga Leonova, one of the most politically active of all teachers, provide further insights into the tension between political involvement and professional responsibilities. When Leonova wrote about the terror, as in a March 1938 article in Izvestiia about the trial of Bukharin, her emphasis was on the threats that "enemies" presented to "the happy and fortunate life" of the children in her class.[44] Even as she became an advocate of state terror, therefore, Leonova continued to present her political identity in terms of protecting educational spaces from the threat of external interference.

The blurring of political and professional identities was also evident in Leonova's description of how delegates responded to the presence of Stalin at the first session of the Supreme Soviet: "When comrade Stalin allowed his affectionate, fatherly, warm gaze to wander around the hall, everyone was overcome by a joyous feeling. We felt as though this sincere gaze was directed at each one of us. As you look on our Stalin, you have a powerful feeling of his greatness, wisdom, and extraordinary modesty." This account closely resembled a description of Leonova's classroom:

> At every lesson, she is greeted by 49 pairs of childrens' eyes, 49 children for whom she is the highest authority, the supreme judge of their actions, the source of knowledge, and their best comrade. How can she avoid being cheered by the happiness of her students and taking on the burden of their sorrow and misfortunes. But externally, Olga Fedorovna [Leonova] is always calm and composed. She is demanding of her children and most of all of herself.

The fact that Leonova referred to Stalin as "our dear teacher" provided further evidence of how she sought to appropriate and reproduce the same patterns of authority, obedience, and loyalty in her relationship with students. These accounts also reveal, however, the discomfort felt by a female teacher active in the public sphere. Describing the purges in terms of the protection of children and the Supreme Soviet and Stalin in terms of classroom and pupil-teacher relationships, Leonova represented her public role in ways that subverted her political authority and drew attention to the more professional aspects of her identity.[45]

Descriptions of Leonova's approach to teaching complete the picture of her political identity.

To ensure that the entire class achieve excellent grades, Leonova encouraged students to assume collective responsibility for those who were lagging behind: "When one of my students received a grade of "satisfactory" in geography, the entire class became concerned. All of the children gathered around with their maps, explaining and demonstrating to the pupil where he made mistakes and how they could be corrected." Clearly believing that the teacher's influence should extend to any sphere related to the development of children, Leonova visited the parents of each of her students in order to discuss the appearance, behavior, friends, and habits of their children. Leonova frequently advised parents on the best ways to bring up their children. One father, praising Leonova for teaching his son "to work normally, love school, and love the collective," described how Leonova called him in to the school, asked about his son's behavior at home, and gave him advice about the proper way to handle his son. As a Supreme Soviet deputy, Leonova applied the same pedagogical approach to her constituents. When a woman complained about her son's academic and disciplinary trouble, Leonova offered to speak to the school director on his behalf, but she also promised to have "a serious conversation" with the boy. Many constituents reportedly came to Leonova's office "just to take counsel on personal affairs with their deputy."[46]

In her statements and her actions, Leonova constructed a political identity that suggested the need for an interventionist, transformative, and authoritarian state. Recreating an idealized classroom relationship, this state was expected to govern based on the acceptance of its authority by clearly defined subordinate groups. Disregarding social and personal boundaries in the same way that the teacher should be involved in every aspect of the socialization of children, the state should interfere in any sphere of life related to the collective welfare of society and the nation. Finally, internalization of strict rules of discipline, acceptance of established hierarchies, and adherence to collective values would make the use of force unnecessary by eliminating all potential for disobedience or nonconformity. This image of a political community was very different from the Soviet state of the

1930s, which used mass violence to enforce submission to a Party line defined by an increasingly arbitrary and unstable leadership, yet stripped of its formulaic glorification of the current leadership, Leonova's image of the state probably made a great deal of sense to Soviet teachers. Promising social stability, respect for knowledge and expertise, a sense of collective responsibility, and the strengthening of the supranational Soviet community, this political vision offered teachers an important and influential role in building a better society.

The creation of an idealized public image was an important aspect of Stalinist political culture, a strategy that silenced critical and non-conformist voices, concealed mistakes and failures, and projected exaggerated and imaginary successes in ways that strengthened and legitimized the existing social and political order. The creation of idealized images of teachers was a clear example of how this political strategy was applied in the sphere of education. In spite of the hagiographic biographical accounts and the offical myths reproduced in these accounts, public discourse actually revealed important aspects of the identity defined by teachers themselves. In addition to expanded educational and occupational opportunities, the Stalinist state offered teachers a professional identity that emphasized their authority in the classroom and their important contribution to the social and political development of Soviet society. In exchange for this authority, teachers took on the role of representing and cultivating acceptance of regime values such as discipline, order, hierarchy, and personal responsibility. While public images primarily reflected government expectations and aspirations, social and cultural values also exerted an important influence, as revealed by the reproduction of assumptions about gender differences that contradicted official declarations of equal treatment for all teachers. The "social contract" between teachers and the state broke down when the state began to apply coercive power against teachers and against those for whom teachers felt a sense of responsibility. Rejecting demands that they act as agents of state terror, many teachers withdrew from the public sphere and attempted to separate their professional identities from the political roles

demanded by the regime. Teachers were thus actively involved in the process of defining their identities, appropriating many official values but also rejecting the more extreme demands of the government. By affirming the value of a profession that had always been, at least in the eyes of teachers, neglected and unappreciated, Soviet political culture encouraged individual teachers to accept government values as a way of making sense of their lives and strengthing their identities as teachers.

Notes

1. Soviet educational and pedagogical reforms of the 1930s are discussed in N. P. Kuzin et al., eds., Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR 1917-1941 gg. (Moscow, 1980), pp. 361-400; F. A. Fradkin, "Opredelenie predmeta i granits pedagogiki v period stanovleniia sovetskoi pedagogicheskoi nauki," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 1 (1979) pp. 85-91; Fradkin, "Stanovlenie i razvitie sredstv pedagogicheskogo poznaniia v istorii sovetskoi pedagogiki," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 12 (1989) pp. 108-116; Fradkin and M. G. Plokhova, "Problemy distsipliny v sovetskoi shkole," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 6 (1991) pp. 91-98; Z. I. Ravkin, "Sovetskaia shkola v period bor'by za zavershenie stroitel'stva sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva i postepennogo perekhoda ot sotsializma k kommunizmu (1935-1941 gg.)," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 6 (June 1950) pp. 97-110; Larry E. Holmes, "Magic into Hocus-Pocus: The Decline of Labor Education in Soviet Russia's Schools, 1931-1937," Russian Review vol. 51 (1992) pp. 545-565; Holmes, The Kremlin and the Schoolhouse (Indianapolis, 1991) pp. 109-140; Gail Warshofsky Lapidus, "Educational Strategies and Cultural Revolution: The Politics of Soviet Development," in Sheila Fitzpatrick, ed., Cultural Revolution in Russia (Bloomington, 1978) pp. 78-104; Dora Shturman, The Soviet Secondary School (New York, 1979) pp. 50-60; James Bowen, Soviet Education: Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment (Madison, 1962); Fred Hechinger, The Big Red Schoolhouse (New York, 1959) pp. 37-55.

2. See the studies in these collections: Richard Altenbaugh, ed., The Teacher's Voice. A Social History of Teaching (London, 1992); Ivor Goodson, ed., Studying Teachers' Lives (New York, 1992); Martin Lawn and Gerald Grace, eds., Teachers: The Culture and Politics of Work (London, 1987); Alison Prentice and Marjorie Theobald, eds., Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching (Toronto, 1991); Donald Warren, ed., American Teachers. Histories of a Profession at Work (New York, 1989).

3. For a discussion of recent historiography on Stalinism, see Sheila Fitzpatrick et al., "New Perspectives on Stalinism," Russian Review vol. 45 (1986) pp. 357-413; vol. 46 (1987) pp. 375-431; for individual examples, see the articles in J. Arch Getty and Roberta Manning, eds., Stalinist Terror. New Perspectives (New York, 1993) as well as Sheila Fitzpatrick, "How the Mice Buried the Cat: Scenes from the Great Purges of 1937 in the Russian Provinces," Russian Review vol. 52 (1993) pp. 299-320; Stephen Kotkin, "Peopling Magnitostroi: The Politics of Demography," in William Rosenberg and Lewis Siegelbaum, eds., Social Dimensions of Soviet Industrialization (Bloomington, 1993) pp. 63-104; Yuri Slezkine, "From Savages to Citizens: The Cultural Revolution in the Soviet Far North, 1928-1938," Slavic Review vol. 51 (Spring 1992) pp. 52-76; David L. Hoffmann, "Moving to Moscow: Patterns of Peasant In-Migration during the First Five-Year Plan," Slavic Review vol. 50 (Winter 1991) pp. 847-857.

4. Vecherniaia Moskva December 11, 1936 p. 1; October 19, 1937 p. 2; October 25, 1937 p. 2; October 28, 1937 p. 1; October 31, 1937 p. 2; November 11, 1937 p. 2; November 14, 1937 p. 2; December 9, 1937 p. 2; January 15, 1938 p. 2; January 17, 1938 p. 1; March 4, 1938 p. 2; April 9, 1938 p. 2; Pravda November 21, 1937 p. 3; Izvestiia November 16, 1937 p. 3; November 21, 1937 p. 1; November 26, 1937 p. 3; Uchitel'skaia gazeta November 7, 1937 p. 4; S. Aleksandrov, "Uchitelia-deputaty," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 2 (February 1938) pp. 17-24; O. F. Leonova, "Obeshchanie dannoe tovarishchu Stalinu vypolneno," Russkii iazyk v shkole No. 5 (1937) pp. 110-111. Leonova's candidacy was also mentioned by Soviet historians. Kuzin et al., eds., Ocherki istorii shkoly p. 354; T. P. Bibanov, "Obshchestvenno-politicheskaia deiatel'nost' uchitel'stva v period sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva (1925-1936)," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 7 (1977) p. 114.

5. Vecherniaia Moskva October 19, 1937 p. 2; November 14, 1937 p. 2; Izvestiia November 26, 1937 p. 3; Uchitel'skaia gazeta, November 7, 1937 p. 4; Aleksandrov, "Uchitelia-deputaty," pp. 21-22. Model School No. 25 became School No. 175 after the 1937 school reform that eliminated the "model school" distinction; the history of this school, one of the best in the Soviet Union, is discussed in Larry E. Holmes, "Legitimizing the Soviet Regime: School No. 25, 1931-1937," in Ben Eklof, ed., School and Society in Tsarist and Soviet Russia (London, 1993) pp. 176-203; Holmes, "The Oral Record and Historical Objectivity (Moscow's Model School No. 25, 1931-1937)," East/West Education vol. 14, no. 1 (Spring 1993) pp. 66-68.

6. Moscow schools had a higher proportion of female and older teachers and fewer Communist Party teachers than other regions of the country. In the city of Moscow, more than three-quarters of elementary teachers had secondary educations and almost half had ten or more years of teaching experience. In the Sverdlovskii region of Moscow where Leonova worked, 95% of elementary teachers were female, 97% did not belong to either the Communist Party or the Communist Youth League (Komsomol), and almost 50% had been born between 1885 and 1900. Figures on educational level and experience are for 1933; figures on gender, Party membership, and age are for 1937. Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva goroda Moskvy (abbreviated TsGAOR i SS g. M) f. 126, op. 12, d. 47, l. 2; f. 528, op. 1, d. 551. Leonova became a candidate member of the Communist Party in January 1938, after she had been elected to the Supreme Soviet. Vecherniaia Moskva January 17, 1938 p. 1.

7. Jan Lee, "Pride and Prejudice: Teachers, Class, and an Inner-City Infants School," in Lawn and Grace, eds., Teachers: The Culture and Politics of Work pp. 93-94; Sara Knopp Biklen, "Can Elementary School-teaching be a Career? A Search for New Ways of Understanding Women's Work," Issues in Education Vol. 3 (Winter 1985) pp. 215-231; Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher. A Sociological Study (Chicago, 1975) pp. 83-100.

8. Izvestiia November 26, 1937 p. 3; Vecherniaia Moskva December 11, 1936 p. 1; Leonova, "Obeshchanie dannoe tovarishchu Stalinu vypolneno," pp. 110-111. Lenin's statement about teachers was made in 1923, as part of a more general description of the educational objectives of the new Soviet state. V.I. Lenin, "Pages from a Diary," in Selected Works in Three Volumes vol. 3 (Moscow, 1977) p. 695. While this statement by Lenin was cited repeatedly in the 1930s, Stalin's only published reference to teachers received considerably less attention. In January 1925, Stalin declared: "The phalanx of mass teachers makes up one of the most essential parts of our country's great army of workers who are building a new life on the basis of socialism." I. V. Stalin, "Uchitel'skomu s"ezdu," Sochineniia t. 7 (Moscow, 1952) p. 3.

9. B. M. Volin, "Shkol'noe delo--na uroven' zadach sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 11 (November 1935) p. 12-13; "Ocherednye zadachi podgotovki k novomu uchebnomu godu," Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 4 (1935) p. 1; Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (abbreviated GARF) f. 2306, op. 69, d. 2222, l. 3-9, 37; N. S. Reznikov, "O Stakhanovskom dvizhenii i zadachakh shkol," Uchitel' i shkola, No.1 (1936) p. 22. The new direction of Stalinist political culture is discussed in Hiroaki Kuromiya, "*Edinonachalie* and the Soviet Industrial Manager, 1928-1937," Soviet Studies vol. 36, no. 2 (1984) pp. 191-199; Moshe Lewin, The Making of the Soviet System, (New York, 1985) p. 252; Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Stalin and the Making of a New Elite, 1928-1939," Slavic Review vol. 38 (1979) p. 390-392; J. Arch Getty, Origins of the Great Purges (Cambridge, 1985) pp. 102-105; Siegelbaum, Stakhanovism and the Politics of Productivity in the USSR, 1935-1941 (Cambridge, 1988) pp. 48-53; Katerina Clark, "Little Heroes and Big Deeds: Literature Responds to the First Five Year Plan," in Fitzpatrick, ed., Cultural Revolution pp. 189-206; and Clark, "Utopian Anthropology as a Context for Stalinist Literature," in Robert C. Tucker, ed., Stalinism. Essays in Historical Interpretation (New York, 1977) pp. 180-198.

10. P. N. Shimbirev, Pedagogika (Moscow, 1940) p. 172 (emphasis in the original). Representative affirmations of the leading role of the teacher defined in Stalinist policy can be found in G. Laman and A. Poliakov, "Puti perestroiki shkoly na osnove postanovleniia TsK VKP(b)," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 11 (November 1931) p. 44-48; "Vooruzhit' uchitelia revoliutsionnoi teoriei Marksa-Lenina-Stalina," Narodnyi uchitel', No. 6 (November December 1933) p. 1; N. K. Goncharov, "Za sovetskuiu pedagogiku," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 10 (October 1938) p. 11; "Vyshe kachestvo uchebnoi raboty," Narodnyi uchitel', No. 4 (April 1932) p. 1; N. Miliutina, "Po boevomu perestroit'sia" Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 11 (November 1931) p. 7. Educational decrees issued by the Communist Party are published in Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR. Obshcheobrazovatel'naia shkola. Sbornik dokumentov 1917-1973 gg. (Moscow, 1973) p. 156-161.

11. "Programma (Proekt) po kursu pedagogiki dlia pedagogicheskikh institutov na 1937/39 uchebnyi god," Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 2 (February 1938) p. 32. This definition was reprinted in "Znamenatel'naia godovshchina" Sovetskaia pedagogika No. 7 (July 1938) p. 8. Similar definitions were in M. V. Sokolov,

"Pedmolodniak na rabote," Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 4 (July August 1934) p. 69.

12. Vecherniaia Moskva September 7, 1936 p. 2; December 11, 1936 p. 1; S. Dziubinskii, "Vospitatel'naia rabota na urokakh istorii SSSR," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 2 (February 1939) p. 67; O. F. Leonova, "Rabota nad razvitiem rechi v sviazi s prikhozhdeniem imeni prilagatel'nogo," Russkii iazyk v shkole No. 3 (1937) pp. 94-98. In 1939, an account of Soviet education was published under Leonova's name for distribution overseas as part of the Soviet propaganda effort. O. Leonova, Public Education in the U.S.S.R. (Moscow, 1939).

13. Joan Scott, Gender and the Politics of History (New York, 1988) pp. 5-7, 28-50. The proportion of women among all teachers decreased from 62% in 1933 to 56% in 1939; according to figures for 1933, women made up a larger proportion of elementary and urban teachers and tended to have more experience and to be better educated than male teachers; women teachers were less likely to be Communist Party or Komsomol members or to be school directors. See my dissertation, "The Teachers of Stalinism: Pedagogy and Political Culture in the Soviet Union, 1931-1939," (University of Michigan, in progress) for discussion of the distribution of men and women in the teaching profession. Statistical information on gender was published in Trud v SSSR (Moscow, 1932) p. 105; Kadry prosveshcheniia (Moscow, 1936), pp. 68-89, 188-196; and Kul'turnoe stroitel'stvo SSSR. Statisticheskii sbornik (Moscow, 1940) pp. 37-50.

14. The one case in which there was discussion of gender differences was the call for more female teachers in Muslim regions of the Soviet Union, where government officials blamed the absence of female teachers on local religious and community elites trying to prevent the Soviet government from carrying out its program of social, political, and economic transformation. The fact that these reports focused on Central Asia placed these studies outside mainstream pedagogical discussions. Like much of Soviet discourse on nationalities, the pronounced emphasis on cultural backwardness in non-European regions meant that these discussions were not perceived as applicable to the rest of Soviet society. Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie March 8, 1932 p. 3; A.E. Spirintsov, "Tadzhikskaia kishlachnaia nachal'naia shkola i ee uchashchiesia I i II klassov," (Scientific Research Institute of Pedagogy, Tadzhik SSR, 1937) p. 91. Available in Nauchnyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii obrazovaniia (abbreviated NA RAO) f. 12, op. 1, d. 87.

15. The equality of male and female teachers was affirmed in Kadry prosveshcheniia pp. 14-15 and N. K. Krupskaia, Zhenshchina strany sovetov--ravnopravnyi grazhdanin (Moscow, 1938) pp. 129-130, 148-149, 162-166. Comparative studies of gender and teachers include Christine Ruane, "Divergent Discourses: The Image of the Russian Woman Schoolteacher in Post-Reform Russia," Russian History Vol. 20, Nos. 1-4 (1993) pp. 109-123; Ruane, "The Vestal Virgins of St. Petersburg: Schoolteachers and the 1897 Marriage Ban," The Russian Review vol. 50 (April 1991) pp. 163-182; Geraldine Joncich Clifford, "Man/Woman/Teacher: Gender, Family, and Career in American Educational History," in Warren, ed., American Teachers pp. 392-343; Clifford, "'Lady Teachers' and Politics in the United States, 1850-1930," in Lawn and Grace, eds., Teachers pp. 3-30; Jo Anne Preston, "Female aspiration and male ideology: school-teaching in nineteenth-century New England," in Arina Angerman, et al., eds., Current Issues in Women's History (London, 1989) pp. 171-182; Richard A. Quantz, "The Complex Visions of Female Teachers and the Failure of Unionization in the 1930s: An Oral History," in Altenbaugh, ed., The Teachers' Voice pp. 139-156; Alison Prentice and Marjorie Theobald, "The Historiography of Women Teachers: A Retrospective," and Marta Danylewycz and Alison Prentice, "Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of 19th and early 20th Century Central Canada," in Prentice and Theobald, eds., Women Who Taught pp. 4-36, 136-159; Mary Hurlbut Cordier, Schoolwomen of the Praries and Plains. Personal Narratives (Albuquerque, 1992); Cecilia Reynolds, "Too Limiting a Liberation: Discourse and Actuality in the Case of Married Women Teachers," in Frieda Forman, et al., eds., Feminism and Education: A Canadian Perspective (Toronto, 1990) pp. 145-165; Marjorie R. Theobald, "Discourse of Danger: Gender and the History of Elementary Schooling in Australia, 1850-1880," Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'education Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1989) pp. 29-52; Courtney Ann Vaughn-Roberson, "Sometimes Independent But Never Equal--Women Teachers, 1900-1950: The Oklahoma Example," Pacific Historical Review vol. 53 (February 1984) pp. 39-58; Leslie Moch, "Government Policy and Women's Experience: The Case of Teachers in France," Feminist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Studies vol. 14, no. 2 (Summer 1988) pp. 301-324; Joanne Schneider, *"Volksschullehrerinnen:* Bavarian Women Defining Themselves Through Their Profession," in Geoffrey Cocks and Konrad Jarausch, eds., German Professions 1800-1950 (Oxford, 1990) pp. 85-103; Kathleen Casey, "Why do Progressive Women Activists Leave Teaching? Theory, Methodology, and Politics in Life-history Research," in Goodson, ed., Studying Teachers' Lives (New York, 1992) pp. 187-208; Noeline Kyle, "Woman's 'Natural Mission' but Man's Real Domain: The Masculinization of the State Elementary Service in New South Wales," in Miriam Henry and Sandra Taylor, eds., Battlers and Bluestockings. Women's Place in Australian Education (Canberra, 1989) pp. 25-34; Dina M. Copelman, "'A New Comradeship between Men and Women': Family, Marriage and London's Women Teachers, 1870-1914," in Jane Lewis, ed., Labour and Love. Women's Experience of Home and Family 1850-1940 (Oxford, 1986) pp. 187-189.

16. Leonova, "Mysli materi-pegagoga o vospitanii," pp. 119-126; Izvestiia November 26, 1937 p. 3.

17. Babina was expelled from the Communist Party and probably dismissed from teaching, although this is not discussed in the article about her case. Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie October 5, 1933 p. 2.

18. TsGAOR i SS g. Moskvy, f. 528, op. 1, d. 71, l. 10; d. 337, l. 16.

19. Copelman, "'A New Comradeship between Men and Women': Family, Marriage and London's Women Teachers, 1870-1914," pp. 187-189; Claudia Koonz, Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family, and Nazi Politics (New York, 1987) pp. 201-208; Joanne Schneider, *"Volksschullehrerinnen:* Bavarian Women Defining Themselves Through Their Profession," pp. 85-103; Cordier, Schoolwomen of the Praries and Plains pp. 35-37; Ruane, "The Vestal Virgins of St. Petersburg: Schoolteachers and the 1897 Marriage Ban," p. 173; Noeline Kyle, "Woman's 'Natural Mission' but Man's Real Domain: The Masculinization of the State Elementary Service in New South Wales," p. 33.

20. Sevast'ianov, A., "Kto on? (Opyt izucheniia pedagogicheskogo molodniaka)," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 11 (November 1931) pp. 90-91.

21. A. Fedorov, "Soveshchanie uchitelei--otlichnikov," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 3 (March 1937) p. 68; I. M. Ponomarev, "Za chto tseniat' narodnuiu uchitel'nitsu V.V. Lupandinu," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 4 (April 1937) pp. 15-18.

22. Leonova, "Mysli materi-pegagoga o vospitanii," pp. 119-126; Izvestiia November 26, 1937 p. 3; Vecherniaia Moskva October 19, 1937 p. 2; November 14, 1937 p. 2; December 9, 1937 p. 2; April 9, 1938 p. 2; Uchitel'skaia gazeta, November 25, 1937 p. 2. Similar differences were evident in descriptions of other prominent teachers. See the examples in K. Motornyi, "Narodnye uchitelia," Narodnyi uchitel', No. 1 (January 1932) pp. 88-92; I. Mikhailov, "Luchshaia natsional'naia snkola," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 7 (July 1934) pp. 38-41. The gendering of public and classroom spaces as male and female respectively is discussed in Clifford, "Man/Woman/Teacher: Gender, Family, and Career in American Educational History," pp. 311-316.

23. Danylewycz and Prentice, "Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of 19th and early 20th Century Central Canada," pp. 136-159; Kyle, "Woman's 'Natural Mission' but Man's Real Domain: The Masculinization of the State Elementary Service in New South Wales," pp. 25-34; Clifford, "'Lady Teachers' and Politics in the United States, 1850-1930," pp. 3-30.

24. Clifford, "Man/Woman/Teacher: Gender, Family, and Career in American Educational History," pp. 392-343; Cordier, Schoolwomen of the Praries and Plains pp. 37-38; Vaughn-Roberson, "Sometimes Independent But Never Equal--Women Teachers, 1900-1950: The Oklahoma Example," pp. 39-58; Joanne Schneider, *"Volksschullehrerinnen:* Bavarian Women Defining Themselves Through Their Profession," pp. 85-103.

25. For discussions of Stalinist tensions between promises of gender equality and continued sex discrimination, see Barbara Evans Clements, "Later Developments: Trends in Soviet Women's History, 1930 to the Present," in Clements, Barbara Alpern Engel, and Christine Worobec, eds., Russia's Women. Accomodation, Resistance, and Transformation (Berkeley, 1991) pp. 267-271; Janet Evans, "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Women's Question: The Case of the 1936 Decree 'In Defence of Mother and Child'," Journal of Contemporary History Vol. 16 (1981) pp. 757-775; Richard Stites, The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia (Princeton, 1978) pp. 386-391; Gail Warshofsky Lapidus, Women in Soviet Society. Equality, Development and Social Change (Berkeley, 1978) pp. 95-119; H. Kent Geiger, The Family in Soviet Russia (Cambridge, 1968) pp. 94-106.

26. Leonova, "Mysli materi-pegagoga o vospitanii," pp. 119-126; Vecherniaia Moskva December 9, 1937 p. 2.

27. "Vykorchevat' do kontsa boleznennye iavleniia v shkole," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 8-9 (August September 1934) p. 6. Similar appeals to teachers were made in Rabichev, "Osnovnye voprosy pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniia," Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 2 (March April 1934) p. 8; NA RAO, f. 17, op. 1, d. 18, l. 72-73; Ia. V., "O zakreplenii uchitelei," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 11 (November 1931) p. 132; Reznikov, "O Stakhanovskom dvizhenii," p. 22; Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie June 8, 1933 p. 2; September 4, 1934 p. 3; GARF, f. 5462, op. 14, d. 176, l. 205. The participation of teachers in the imperialist projects of Soviet "cultural development" among the indigenous Arctic peoples is discussed in Slezkine, "From Savages to Citizens: The Cultural Revolution in the Soviet Far North, 1928-1938," pp. 52-76.

28. Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System, Schedule A, No. 387, p. 29.

29. Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie January 11, 1932 p. 3; March 20, 1932 p. 1; January 9, 1933 p. 2; June 21, 1933 p. 2; August 28, 1933 p. 2; November 3, 1933 p. 2; G. Bychkov, "Po Karatuzskomu raionu," Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 13-15 (November 1, 1932) p. 84; Iv. Legchenko, "Nastoichivo vesti bor'bu za leninskoe otnoshenie k uchiteliu" Prosveshchenie Sibiri, No. 8 (1933) pp. 9-11; GARF, f. 5462, op. 14, d. 235, l. 3.

30. Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie May 22, 1934 p. 1. Other cases involving teachers using Central Committee instructions to defend their interests were in Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie February 15, 1932, p. 3; November 3, 1933 p. 2; GARF, f. 5462, op. 14, d. 176, l. 191; op. 13, d. 158, l. 303; Bychkov, "Po Karatuzskomu raionu," p. 84; Legchenko, "Nastoichivo vesti bor'bu," pp. 9-11.

31. Interview with Semen Efimovich Khoze, conducted in Moscow by the author, November 18, 1992.

32. Vladimir D. Samarin, "The Soviet School, 1936-1942," in Kline, ed., Soviet Education p. 33. Similar experiences were described in Harvard Project, Schedule A, No. 166, p. 7; Schedule A, No. 111, p. 6A, 14 and Schedule A, No. 1434, p. 4, 24.

33. The distinction between these terms is discussed in William G. Rosenberg, "Identities, Power, and Social Interactions in Revolutionary Russia," Slavic Review vol. 47 (Spring 1988) pp. 22-23.

34. Offical pedagogy and the classroom practices of teachers are discussed in Chapter Four of my dissertation, "The Teachers of Stalinism."

35. Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie March 29, 1933 p. 2; August 12, 1934 p. 3; Uchitel'skaia gazeta November 27, 1937 p. 1; "Unichtozhit' vragov naroda," Nachal'naia shkola, No. 8 (August 1937) pp. 1-9; "Bol'she bditel'nosti!" Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 2 (March April 1935) pp. 9-12.

36. Examples from GARF, f. 2306, op. 69, d. 2357, l. 28; d. 3518, ll. 38-43; Tsentr khraneniia dokumentov molodezhnykh organizatsii, f. 1, op. 3, d. 159, ll. 75, 82-83. Because of the layers of deception and ambiguity that surrounded the terror on all levels, it is very difficult to judge how many teachers became victims of the Stalinist purges. Drawing on indirect evidence, it is possible to estimate that about 3% of teachers were dismissed in the year 1937, the worst period of the terror. Of the more than 900,000 teachers in 1937/1938, this would mean about 30,000 dismissals in this one year. During the certification campaign of 1936-1939, approximately 3% of all teachers were dismissed; in some regions, this figure was higher, as in the Dagestan region, where 20% of teachers had been dismissed by January 1938, the Kalmytskaia Republic, where 16% of teachers had been dismissed by January 1937, or Kiev oblast, where 11% of teachers had been dismissed by September 1937. There is no way to know, however, how many of these dismissals were for political reasons and how many were because of incompetence or lack of education; in addition, many teachers whose dismissals resulted from unfounded accusations or "excessive vigilance" were restored to teaching on appeal. The impact of state terror on teachers is discussed in Chapter Six of my dissertation, "The Teachers of Stalinism." Pravda July 15, 1939 p. 4; N. Sh. Tashninov, Ocherki istorii prosveshcheniia Kalmytskoi ASSR (Elista, 1969) p. 155; Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie, September 15, 1937 p. 2; Uchitel'skaia gazeta September 17, 1938 p. 1.

37. These comments were made at a meeting organized by Narkompros in March 1937. GARF f. 2306, op. 69, d. 2298, l. 46.

38. Harvard Project, Schedule A, No. 61, p. 14.

39. Tsentr khraneniia i izucheniia dokumentov noveishei istorii, f. 17, op. 120, d. 237, l. 60; Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie March 5, 1933 p. 1; March 29, 1933 p. 2.

40. "Ovladet' bol'shevizmom!" Nachal'naia shkola, No. 10 (October 1937) pp. 1-4; NA RAO, f. 10, op. 1, d. 13, l. 131; f. 17, op. 1, d. 18, l. 77-78; A. Bychkova, "Bol'she klassovoi bditel'nosti," Narodnyi uchitel', No. 4 (July August 1933) pp. 6-7.

41. NA RAO, f. 17, op. 1, d. 63, ll. 181-238. Similar complaints about the apolitical attitudes of teachers were expressed in Uchitel'skaia gazeta December 23, 1937 p. 3; Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie February 12, 1933 p. 2.

42. GARF, f. 2306, op. 69, d. 3518, l. 155-158.

43. Discussion of the totalizing aspirations of Stalinism is in Geoff Eley, "History with the Politics Left Out--Again?" Russian Review vol. 45 (1986) p. 390.

44. Izvestiia March 4, 1938 p. 2.

45. Vecherniaia Moskva January 17, 1938 p. 1; March 4, 1938 p. 2; April 9, 1938 p. 2. Historian Courtney Ann Vaughn-Roberson argues that as female teachers in Oklahoma began to assert themselves in public and political ways, including organizing unions, protesting against unequal pay, and demanding more opportunities for promotion into administrative positions, they continued to define themselves in terms of traditional feminine roles and did not challenge the separation of male/public and female/domestic spheres. Vaughn-Roberson, "Sometimes Independent But Never Equal--Women Teachers, 1900-1950: The Oklahoma Example," pp. 49-58.

46. Vecherniaia Moskva December 11, 1936 p. 1; October 19, 1937 p. 2; December 9, 1937 p. 2; January 17, 1938 p. 3; Izvestiia November 16, 1937 p. 3; November 26, 1937 p. 3; Uchitel'skaia gazeta, November 7, 1937 p. 4; Leonova, "Mysli materi-pegagoga o vospitanii," pp. 119-126.